

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

LUZ PAULINO-SANTOS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY, et al.,

Defendants.

23-CV-3471 (JGLC)

ORDER

JESSICA G. L. CLARKE, United States District Judge:

After reviewing the parties' joint submission (ECF No. 138) and considering counsels' arguments yesterday, the Court grants Defendants' motion to compel. The Court agrees that Plaintiffs' response to Interrogatory No. 18 fails to provide sufficient, responsive information to Defendants' request. Plaintiffs' response simply states that the MTA should be ordered to adopt a policy that sets ride times based on a comparison to fixed-route trips and direct driving times, without describing in any detail how the times should compare. Plaintiffs' response also incorrectly presumes that this issue is one for damages only, and not liability. However, Defendants are, at a minimum, entitled to make an undue hardship defense to Plaintiffs' reasonable accommodation claim. This request is relevant to that defense.

Unlike Plaintiffs' responses to Interrogatory Nos. 16, 17 and 19, Plaintiffs' response to Interrogatory No. 18 does not provide Defendants with sufficient information as to the accommodation Plaintiffs are requesting here with respect to routing and trip length, and is therefore insufficient for Defendants to formulate a defense with respect to this issue. Although the Court understands that providing precise times may not be feasible, Plaintiffs do not describe in any detail what a reasonable comparison would be here. As such, Plaintiffs are directed to

provide, within two weeks of today's date, further responsive information—in line with Plaintiffs' responses to Interrogatory Nos. 16, 17, and 19—to Defendants' Interrogatory No. 18.

Dated: July 15, 2025
New York, New York

SO ORDERED.



JESSICA G. L. CLARKE
United States District Judge